

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 LAURA FUJISAWA, et al.) No. C07-5642 BZ
12 Plaintiff(s),)
13 v.) Related Cases: C07-3431 BZ
14 COMPASS VISION, INC., et) C08-4118 BZ
15 al.,) C09-2016 BZ
16 Defendant(s).)
17 _____)
18)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

Having reviewed the recent filings, the Court
supplements its final pretrial order in the following
respects:

1. The Court intends to limit the total time of trial
to 51 hours with each party tentatively having 17 hours to
put on testimony, both direct and cross-examination, assuming
Compass satisfies me that it needs this much time.

2. The Court proposes to consolidate this case with the
cases of the other plaintiffs in this case and related cases
Wilson v. Compass Vision, Inc., C07-3431 BZ; Garlick v.
Compass Vision, Inc., C08-4118 BZ; Byrum v. Compass Vision,

1 Inc., C09-2016 BZ, for the limited purpose of trying the
2 following issues:

3 (1) Did Compass Vision negligently promote the use
4 of EtG testing as a method of detecting alcohol
5 abuse to the California Board of Pharmacy.

6 (2) Did National negligently promote the use of EtG
7 testing as a method of detecting alcohol abuse to
8 the California Board of Pharmacy.

9 (3) Did Compass Vision negligently advise the
10 California Board of Pharmacy to initially establish
11 250 Ng/mL as the cutoff for declaring an EtG test
12 positive.

13 (4) Did National negligently advise the California
14 Board of Pharmacy to initially establish
15 250 Ng/mL as the cutoff for declaring an EtG test
16 positive.

17 (5) After the SAMSHA September 2006 advisory was
18 promulgated, was Compass Vision negligent in
19 recommending that the California Board of Pharmacy
20 continue to rely on EtG testing.

21 (6) After the SAMSHA September 2006 advisory was
22 promulgated, was National negligent in recommending
23 that the California Board of Pharmacy continue to
24 rely on EtG testing.

25 The Court intends to include these issues in the special
26 verdict. Any objections to the phrasing of these issues, or
27 any requests to include additional issues, shall be filed by
28 **noon on November 23, 2010.**

The parties are **ORDERED** to appear for trial at **8:00 a.m.** on **November 29, 2010** to address these issues and any remaining expert witnesses issues. The parties are directed to expedite expert testimony by stipulating to their qualifications where possible and generally minimizing the amount of time spent on their qualifications.

Dated: November 18, 2010


Bernard Zimmerman
United States Magistrate Judge

G:\BZALL\~BZCASES\FUJISAWA V. COMPASS VISION\PRETRIAL\SUPPLEMENTAL PRETRIAL ORD.wpd